Application No. 10/012,003

Amendment dated: March 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 28, 2004

TOTAL FOREIGN

29. (Cancelled)

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 19, 21 and 25. Claim 29 was cancelled. Claims 1, 16 and 19-28 are now in the application. Applicant submits that the independent claim remaining in the application reads on all species disclosed, and thus is generic.

Claim 1 was amended to more clearly identify the properties of the cleaning solution portion of the composition. In particular, the claim was amended by including part of the subject matter previously included in claim 19 and by clearly specifying that the cleaning solution portion of the composition is substantially free of hydrochloric acid. Claim 19 was amended to remove overlap in subject matter with amended claim 1. Claims 21, 23 and 25 were amended in view of the amendments made to claim 1 to ensure consistent definition of the cleaning solution portion of the composition. No new matter was introduced by any of the claim amendments made, it being clearly apparent from the specification as originally filed that hydrochloric acid free cleaning solution portions (hydrochloric acid content 0%) were included in the range of exemplary compositions disclosed and previously claimed.

Arguments

The Examiner's rejection of claim 29 for lack of antecedent is rendered moot by the cancellation of the claim. The Examiner's rejection of claim 29 for lack of novelty has been addressed by cancellation of the claim.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 16 and 19-29 of the application as being obvious over Vermeer et al (USP 5,750,733). This rejection is now believed overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 21, 23 and 25, limiting the cleaning solution portion to sulfamic acid containing,

Custimuary.

cited by the examiner.

Amendment dated: March 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 28, 2004

hydrochloric acid free portions. From a study of the description and examples, it is apparent and a major of the study of the description and examples, it is apparent and a major of the study of the description and examples, it is apparent and a major of the study of the description and examples, it is apparent and a major of the study of the description and examples, it is apparent and a major of the description and examples are study of the description and examples are study of the description and examples. ಬ್ರಾಕ್ಷಮ್ ಎ

that the Vermeer reference teaches a hard surface cleaning composition comprising an alkyl glycamide surfactant, peroxide bleaching agent, such as sodium peroxide or peracetic acid 🛶 and optional components, such as isopropanol. Vermeer neither teaches nor even suggests a cleaning composition including a cleaning solution portion and a disinfectant solution portion. wherein the cleaning solution portion includes sulfamic acid together with a further acid component and is substantially free of hydrochloric acid. The use of sulfamic acid as the base acid component of the composition is not apparent from Vermeer nor is the advantage of a hydrochloric acid free composition, which is a less corrosive composition, namely the reduced danger of injury to the user of the cleaning composition. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Vermeer, whether taken alone or in combination with other prior art

Claims 16 and 19 to 28 are all either directly or indirectly dependent from amended claim 1. Thus, they are narrower in scope than the independent claim. As such, Applicant submits that claims 16 and 19-28 are patentable over Vermeer whether taken alone or in combination. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 19-28 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 16 and 19-29 of the application as being obvious over O'Neal jr. (USP 6,051,108). This rejection is also believed overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 21, 23 and 25, limiting the cleaning solution portion to sulfamic acid containing, hydrochloric acid free portions. O'Neal jr. teaches a cleaning solution for processing equipment including an organic acid, peracetic acid, a surfactant and glycol ether. O'Neal jr. Application No. 10/012,003

Amendment dated. March 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 28, 2004

The control of the second of the company districts

neither teaches nor even suggests a cleaning composition including a cleaning solution as a composition and a disinfectant solution portion, wherein the cleaning solution portion includes sulfamic acid together with a further acid component and is substantially free of hydrochloric acid. The use of sulfamic acid, which is not an organic acid, as the base acid component of the solution is not apparent from O'Neal jr. nor is the advantage of a hydrochloric acid free composition, namely reduced danger of injury to the user of the cleaning composition. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of O'Neal jr., whether taken alone or in combination with other prior art cited by the examiner.

The above arguments raised in reply to the rejection on the basis of O'Neal jr. also apply to the rejection of claims 16 and 19 to 28, which are all either directly or indirectly dependent from amended claim 1. As such, Applicant submits that claims 16 and 19-28 are patentable over O'Neal jr. whether taken alone or in combination. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 19-28 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits action to that end.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit \$750.00 in government fees for the Petition to Revive for Unintentional Abandonment which is being submitted together with this response, from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, and credit or any over payments to Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP.

Application No. 10/012,003

Amendment dated: March 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 28, 2004

COUNTRY GO HA

Applicant respectfully submits herewith a Revocation of Power of Attorney with New Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address and Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b), appointing the practitioners associated with customer number 42534.

Respectfully submitted, SCHULHOFF, Jeffrey et al.

By: Dennis R. Haszko Registration No. 39,575

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS, LLP World Exchange Plaza 100 Queen Street, Suite 1100 Ottawa ON K1P 1J9 Canada Telephone 613-787-3736 e-mail: dhaszko@blgcanada.com